



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,209	03/19/2004	Scott Clohessy	000242.00171	6511

31743 7590 02/04/2009  
PATENT GROUP GA030-43  
GEORGIA-PACIFIC LLC  
133 PEACHTREE STREET, N.E.  
ATLANTA, GA 30303-1847

EXAMINER
----------

ELKINS, GARY E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3782

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/04/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 22 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingalls (US 2003/0132275) in view of Heaps, Jr. et al (US 4,850,506), Ballard (US 4,226,327) and Wilson (US 5,261,536). Ingalls discloses a corrugated container including a double wall fiberboard laminated to a multiple wall fiberboard. Ingalls does not disclose a polymer film wrapped around the outside of the sidewalls and having a wrap tension of at least about four pounds per foot (cl. 22) or formation of the film from polyethylene and stretching of the film by at least about 200% (cl. 27). Heaps, Jr. et al teaches that it is known to reinforce the sidewalls of a multi-ply corrugated container by wrapping the outside of the container in tension. Ballard teaches that it is known to reinforce a corrugated container by using a film in tension around the outside of the corrugated walls. Wilson teaches that it is known to reinforce a container using a stretch wrap formed from polyethylene film where the stretching is between 50 to 500% during wrapping about a container load. It would have been obvious to reinforce the container of Ingalls using straps in tension around the outside of the container as taught by Heaps, Jr. et al to strengthen the walls of the container against bulging and/or against stress resulting from transport of the container. It would further have been obvious to substitute reinforcing film for the straps in modified Ingalls as taught by Ballard to provide a more even reinforcement of the

Art Unit: 3782

sidewalls and as a simple substitution of one known sidewall reinforcing element for another to obtain predictable results. See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1742; 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007). With respect to claim 27, it would have been obvious to make the film in modified Ingalls as a stretch polyethylene film and with a stretch of at least about 200% in view of Wilson. The stretch of 200% is considered well within the common known limits of stretch film when wrapping around a container load. With respect to claim 22, it would have been obvious to make the film in modified Ingalls from a stretch polyethylene film as taught by Wilson and to make the wrap tension at least about four pounds per foot as a matter of routine in determining the tension required of the particular plastic being used and the particular elongation or stretch desired, i.e. the wrap tension needed is merely a determination of the wrap tension needed and amounts to no more than routine knowledge of the known material properties.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 1-8 and 10-14 are allowed.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22 and 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 3782

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

/Gary E. Elkins/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3782